

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 15, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9 and 12 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 2-3, 6-7 and 10-11 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9 and 12 have been amended. These amendments are supported by the specification as originally filed and, in particular, paragraphs 0059-0060 and Figure 10.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Silverbrook (U.S. Patent No. 5,984,446) in view of Goetz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,978,971). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

(b) storing color image data for a partial area of an image to be printed corresponding to a height of entire nozzles of the print head in the sub scanning direction that are used during each main scanning pass of color printing into a first buffer, but not the entirety of the color image data for the image to be printed;

(c) selecting not the entirety but a part of the stored color image data that represent a color image part on a plurality of printing-subject lines subject to recording of ink dots performed by the plurality of nozzle groups during a single main scan from the first buffer;

(d) performing a color conversion process on the selected color image data and not on the entirety of

the color image data and a halftone process . . . on
the converted color image data

. . .
the selecting includes repeatedly selecting an
identical pixel value of the color image data
(Rprint/Rdata) times for use in the halftone process

Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear that the cited references including Silverbrook (US 5,984,446), Goetz et al. (US 4,978,971), and Cheung et al. (US 5,973,803) do not teach or suggest the above highlighted limitations of claim 1.

In particular, the cited references do not teach or suggest the above feature (d) of performing a color conversion process on the selected color image data and not on the entirety of the color image data, and performing a halftone process on the converted color image data.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and 4 would not have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Silverbrook in view of Goetz, because the references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features and limitations of the claims. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Cheung et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,803) does not supplement for the deficiencies of Silverbrook and Goetz. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and claim 4 at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Applicant further respectfully submits independent claims 5 and 9 are patentable over the cited combination for similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 9 and claims 8 and 12 at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 5 and 9.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Logan J. Brown 58,290/
Logan J. Brown
Registration No. 58,290

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 23, 2008